UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/562,641	06/14/2006	Prasenjit Sen	U 016085-0	8486	
140 LADAS & PAF	7590 07/20/200 RRY LLP	9	EXAMINER		
26 WEST 61ST			YANG, JIE		
NEW YORK, N	N1 10023		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1793		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/20/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/562,641	SEN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JIE YANG	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addres	ss
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RIWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by s Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUN FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC statute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this community ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on (2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice under the closed in accordance with the practice.	This action is non-final. owance except for formal ma		erits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10,12-19 and 21 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-19 is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 and 21 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction a Application Papers	drawn from consideration.		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the continuous The oath or declaration is objected to by the	o the drawing(s) be held in abeya prrection is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a 	ments have been received. ments have been received in priority documents have bee ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Staç	ge
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	B) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 	

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 11 and 20 are cancelled; claims 12-19 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected group; and claims 1-10 and 21 remain for examination. No amendments to the claims have been made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al (JP 04-350107 with machine English translation, thereafter JP'107) in view of Akiyoshi (JP 02-166202, thereafter JP'202).

JP'107 in view of JP'202 is applied to the claims 1-5 and 7-19 for the same reason as stated in the previous rejection dated 12/8/2008.

Claims 5, 6 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP'107 in view of JP'202 as applied to claims 1-5 and 7-10, and further in view of Ryzkov (US 6,884,405 B2, thereafter US'405).

JP'107 in view of JP'202 and US'405 is applied to the claims 5, 6, and 21 for the same reason as stated in the previous rejection dated 12/8/2008.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 5/8/2009 with respect to claims 1-10 and 21 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments are summarized as follows:

- 1) JP'107 does not disclose a process for the production of the metallic nanoparticles because JP'107 discloses a method for producing metal nitride powder and the particles are not described as nanoparticles;
- 2) particles produced in JP'202 are not nanoparticles because they are described as small diameter metal particles having about 0.1 to 0.01 µm diameter; and the arc discharge taught by JP'202 is not same process as recited in the process.
- 3) The process of US'405 differs from the claimed process because the process of spark explosion and the melting the electrodes as recited in the instant claim is different with the arc process as taught by US'405. US'405 doe not teach current density of one million amperes per square meter as recited in the instant claim 6.

Responses are as follows:

Regarding the arguments 1)-3), the applicant's arguments are against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references

individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In the instant case, JP'107 in view of JP'202 is applied to the claims 1-5 and 7-19 and JP'107 in view of JP'202 and US'405 is applied to the claims 5, 6, and 21, respectively. The Examiner notes that JP'202 teaches that small diameter metal particles have about 0.01 to 0.01 µm diameter (they are about 100nm to 10nm), which fully meets the limitation of nanoparticles as recited in the instant invention (refer to Fig.9 of the instant specification). The Examiner further notes that JP'107 clearly teaches the spark discharge (Paragraph [0010] and Fig. 2 of JP'107), which reads on the spark limitation as recited in the instant claims (also refer to the Fig.4 of the instant specification).

Still regarding argument 3, US'405 teaches the graphite and metal electrodes with variable cross section in order to carry desired arc current 100 to 400A/cm² (Col.22, lines 28-53 of US'405), which is in the level of one million to four million A/m².

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jie Yang whose telephone number is 571-270-1884. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-2721244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JY

/Roy King/

Application/Control Number: 10/562,641

Page 6

Art Unit: 1793

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793